



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,243	04/03/2000	Arthur W. Wang	PD-990212	4723

20991 7590 04/01/2002

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION
BLDG 001 M/S A109
P O BOX 956
EL SEGUNDO, CA 902450956

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHI Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3637

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/542,243

Applicant(s)

WANG, ARTHUR W.

Examiner

Chi Q Nguyen

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 April 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawal of Finality of Last Office Action

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. Further, in view of consideration of new art, new grounds of rejection are presented as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 17 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliver (US 6,166,329) in view of McDonald (US 6,335,753).

Oliver discloses a building pre-wired for electrical outlets including a plurality of studs 40, electrical wires 18 adjacent to studs 40, connector 10, a drywall 42 encloses from therein (figs. 3A, 3B).

Oliver's wiring is for electrical outlets and does not disclose the wires used for satellite connection.

McDonald discloses building wired for satellite communication including wires (18,30) that connect the roof mounted antennae on the roof to outlets in the wall thus providing terminations for the wire outside the building and inside the building. Outlets tend to be

Art Unit: 3635

standardized for use such as electrical or phone. Figure 3 of McDonald shows a standardized phone jack (32). This is considered to be "universal connector"

Oliver shows that pre-wiring a house is old and well known. Although he only discloses electrical wiring, it is considered obvious in the art to pre-wire with all desired wiring needs including satellite antenna connections as suggested by McDonald.

In regard to claims 19-20, combining different function jacks into one connector plate is well known in the wiring and would be obvious for Oliver's structure as modified by McDonald.

3. Claims 21-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliver (US 6,166,329) in view of McDonald (US 6,335,753) and Mast et al (US 6,166,705).

Oliver, McDonald disclose the structural elements for satellite cable ready except for a random enclosing a flat satellite and positioned within low-profile sized, color match a roof random. Mast teaches a two-dimensional phased array antenna having antenna elements 30 are distributed on a flat grid-configured frame 10 (fig. 2, col. 3). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Oliver's, McDonald's, Chaney's with Mast's teaching for two-dimensional phased array antenna enclosing within the random. The suggestion for doing so would have been to provide satellite wire ready and conveniently for home and office uses and better protection for antenna.

With regard to claim 24, a random has a color to substantially match a roof color; examiner considers it would have been obvious matter of design choice to have a

Art Unit: 3635

particular random to match the roof color for cosmetic purpose, so as to blend the antenna into the roof.

4. Claims 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliver (6,166,329) in view of Mast (6,166,705) and Spano (US 6,204,823) and Iwamura (US 5,940,028).

Oliver and Mast disclose the structural elements for satellite cable ready for buildings except for antenna having remote control for positioning and variable-inclination mechanism. Spano teaches an elevation drive mechanism is mounted on the support plate and interconnects the antenna for pivoting the antenna a predetermined angle and adjusting elevation of the antenna (see abstract). And Iwamura teaches system and method for aligning an antenna including a remote control 15, and antenna 1 (see fig. 1). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Oliver's, Mast's inventions with Spano and Iwamura for inclination mechanism and antenna remote control. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the antenna receiving the strong signal at any angle.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Monday-Thursday (7:00-5:00), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor Carl D. Friedman at (703) 308-0839.

CQN 3/18/02


Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600